



In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

*Copy of
response
#23*

Application Number: 09/629,749
Application Filed: 07/31/00
Applicant: Durham Russell Maples, Camden, SC;

Application Title: A Method for Enhancing the Equity of a Business Entity
Art Unit: 3621
Examiner/GAU: Pierre Eddy Elisca

RECEIVED
MAR 25 2003
GROUP 3600

Amendment E

1. This is in response to the detailed action mailed on February 21, 2003.

Remarks

2. The Applicant had spoken by phone on October 28, 2003 with the Examiner named above and the Examiner stated that he had allowed the claims of the application. He stated that there was another review pending of the application. February 25, 2003 I received a detailed action stating that the claims had been rejected for these reasons. I can only assume that the Second Examiner had these objections and also assume that these are the only objections that both Examiners now have.

2. Claims 38-48 were rejected for three reasons by the examiner(s).

Reason 1. The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph because while claims 38-48 contained method steps, the body of the claim had physical entities ("debt instrument", "business entity") with functional language but no positively recited steps.

Reason 2. The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph because the phrase "said share or shares of equity of said business entity" was confusing and made no sense.

Reason 3. The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because there is no computer performing any step.

A copy of the pages that outline the explanation by the Examiner sent in the last detailed action are enclosed. Page 2 of the last detailed action is underlined at 2 sentences. The Applicant will refer to the Examiner's statements further in the response.